



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,464	03/15/2007	John Aubrey Allen	4015-5822	2108
24112 7590 03/30/2011 COATS & BENNETT, PLLC 1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300 Cary, NC 27518				
EXAMINER				
JONES, PRENELL P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2467				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/30/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/578,464

Applicant(s)

ALLEN, JOHN AUBREY

Examiner

PRENELL P. JONES

Art Unit

2467

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-912)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 20 and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenberg (NPL titled: Supporting Intermediary Session Policies in SIP).

Regarding claim 20 and 38, Rosenberg discloses a call set-up system to set-up calls across packet switching network (Proxy servers) (page 1-Abstract, page 3-paragraph 1,) connected to each other by network address translation (NAT) devices , comprising a plurality of call agents configured to send and receive messages to and from other call agents (see Fig. 2, page 3–paragraph 1, page 5, paragraph 2, 3 & 5, page 24-Fig. 6, paragraph 1, 2 & 3), the messages including address information for media packets within the packet-switched networks to define a media path of the call (Fig. 1 & 5, page 3-paragraph 5, page 5-paragraph 1, page 6-last paragraph, page 8-paragraph 4, page 12-paragraph 2 & 3, page 15-last paragraph) wherein at least one of the messages includes address information sent to a preceding call agent involved in the set-up of the call (Fig. 3, 5,& 6, page 1-paragraph 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg (NPL titled: Supporting Intermediary Session Policies in SIP) in view of Harris (2004/0114590).

Regarding claim 21 and 22, claims 21 and 22 contain all the limitations of claim 20 except for scanning received messages. Harris discloses querying/searching received call setup messages (see Fig. 1, 2 and 5, paragraph, 0008, 0054 and 0106)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement querying/searching received call setup messages as taught by Harris with the teachings of Rosenberg for the purpose of further supporting coherent SIP communication between multiple users.

Regarding claim 23, Rosenberg further discloses a call set-up system of claim 22 wherein a media path opened through a NAT device for re-entry to a network is closed (page 3, paragraph 1, Rosenberg discloses closing media pinholes via rerouting to network).

Regarding claim 24, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein one or more of the messages include session descriptions (page 3-paragraph 4, page 4-paragraph 5).

Regarding claim 25, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein at least one message includes encrypted address information (page 4, paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 26, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein at least one message includes a reference to address information stored within the plurality of packet-switched networks (page 1, Abstract, page 8-paragraph 4, page 11, line 1-5).

Regarding claim 27, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein at least one message includes an identifier of a packet-switched network that media packets are to traverse (page 5-paragraph 2, page 7, paragraph 3, page 13-paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 28, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 27 wherein each of the plurality of packet-switched networks has a globally unique identifier (page 13-paragraph 1).

Regarding claim 29, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein the call agents are configured to format the messages according to an offer/answer protocol (page 14-paragraph 2, 3 and 4).

Regarding claim 30, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 29 wherein the offer/answer protocol is Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) (page 10-paragraph 10, page 14-paragraph 2, 3 and 40).

Regarding claim 31, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 30 wherein the address information for media packets is sent to the call agents involved in the call-set up in a stack structure as a multipart attachment to the SIP message (page 13-paragraph 2 & 3).

Regarding claim 32, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 31 wherein if the stack structure includes an entry for the region being entered by the message, the call agent receiving the message is configured to scan the stack structure and to make the oldest matching entry the new session description (page 11 and 14) .

Regarding claim 33, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 32 wherein the call agent receiving the message is further configured to close a pinhole opened in a NAT device associated with the region being entered by the message(page 3, 6, 15, 19).

Regarding claim 34, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 32 wherein if the stack structure does not include an entry for the region being left by an answer message, the call agent sending the message is configured to close a pinhole in a NAT device associated with that region (page 3-paragraph 1).

Regarding claim 35, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein the call agents are arranged to control the NAT devices (page 3-paragraph 1).

Regarding claim 36, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 35 wherein are the call agents are incorporated in the NAT devices (Fig. 2, page 19).

Regarding claim 37, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein at least one of the packet-switched networks comprises a 3G radio network (page 3-paragraph 2).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prenell P. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-3180. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pankaj Kumar can be reached on 571-272-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prenell P. Jones

March 20, 2011

/Prenell P Jones/

Examiner, Art Unit 2467

/Pankaj Kumar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2467